



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/754,118	01/05/2001	Mario Donald Neuleib	8528-004-64	3274

7590                    05/15/2002

CATHERINE B. RICHARDSON, ESQ.  
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.  
P. O. BOX 1404  
ALEXANDRIA,, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHI Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3637

DATE MAILED: 05/15/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/754,118	NEULEIB, MARLO DONALD
	Examiner Chi Q Nguyen	Art Unit 3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2001.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.                  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Double Patenting***

1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

2. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-15 of prior U.S. Patent No. 2002/0046543. This is a double patenting rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 1, 6, 8, 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Emmons (US 2001/0045078).

Emmons discloses traction pad for maneuvering on a roof comprising closed connecting material 10, non-skid material layer 12, plurality of steps 14 are made by foam or other

material as preferred such as high impact plastic, parallel and attaching to connecting material 10, a handle 17, plurality of holes 18 (see figs. 1-2, cols. 1-2).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-5, 7, 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emmons (US 2001/0045078) in view of Collavino (US 6,092,623). Emmons discloses traction pad for maneuvering on a roof comprising closed connecting material 10, non-skid material layer 12, plurality of steps 14 are parallel and attaching to connecting material 10, a handle 17, plurality of holes 18.

Emmons does not disclose expressly and specifically the steps are spaced apart approximately 20-36", connecting material is ~10-36" wide, nylon 6000# seat belt webbing, nylon 900-1000 denier, a lifeline attachable to the handle, a ruler demarcations along one edge.

Collavino teaches a safety anchor system having a lifeline 80 (fig. 1). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Emmons's invention with Collavino for a lifeline. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide more safety for constructor in case of falling from the roof.

Emmons and Collavino disclose the structural elements for step system except for specific dimension, strength and provide a well known ruler to constructor, examiner

Art Unit: 3637

considers this would been an obvious matter of design choice to obtain specific dimension and strength for desirable application.

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. French Patent No. 2606827 and German Patent No. 3719969 teaches step system.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chi Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-1224, Monday-Thursday (7:00-5:00), Fridays off or examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached at (703) 308-2486. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding assigned are (703) 872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

CQN

5/2/02

LANNA MAI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

